

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5

Applicant: M. Cusson, et al.

Paper No.:

Application No.: 09/294,656

Group Art Unit: 3624

Filed: 4/19/99

Examiner: Colbert

10 Title: *Web servers with queryable dynamic caches*

Commissioner for Patents
 15 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response to a non-final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.111**Summary of the prosecution**

20 This application was filed 4/19/99 and has been under prosecution since 6/20/00 under two examiners. An appeal filed 9/11/2003 led to reopening of prosecution on 6/14/04; since the reopening of prosecution there have been six non-final Office actions; this response is to the non-final Office action of 2/6/06, in which Examiner rejected claims 112, 119, and 141 under 35 U.S.C. second paragraph, objected to the Drawing and Specification because of

25 lack of agreement between them with regard to the use of reference numbers, objected to the Abstract as not being on a separate page, and rejected claims 112-114, 119, 120, 124, 125, 128, and 131 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over the combination of US 5,924,096, Draper, and Divyesh Jadav and Monish Gupta, *Caching of large database objects in Web servers*, IEEE 1997, hereafter Jadav and Gupta. Applicants requested a telephonic interview

30 with Examiner, which Examiner graciously granted on March 8. In preparation for the interview, Applicants' attorney faxed Examiner a written *Argument* which demonstrated why the claims were not obvious over Draper and Jadav and Gupta. During the interview, Examiner suggested that claim 112 be amended so that its language follow that of claim 119 more closely.

In this response, Applicants' attorney has accepted Examiner's suggestion concerning claim 119, has amended claim 125 along the same lines, has overcome the objections to the Specification, Drawing, and Abstract by providing an amended Drawing, a replacement Specification that has been amended so that it agrees with the amended Drawing, and an
5 amended Abstract, and is repeating the reasoning set forth in the *Argument* to demonstrate that the combination of Draper and Jadav and Gupta does not render the claims as amended obvious.

Please amend the claims as follows: